



Dave Yost • Auditor of State



KATE LOVE SIMPSON LIBRARY  
MORGAN COUNTY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| TITLE   | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Independent Accountants' Report on Applying Agreed-Upon Procedures..... | 1    |

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

## INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANTS' REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Kate Love Simpson Library  
Morgan County  
358 East Main Street  
McConnelsville, Ohio 43756

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, with which the Board of Trustees and the management of the Kate Love Simpson Library, Morgan County, Ohio (the Library), agreed, solely to assist the Board in evaluating receipts, disbursements and balances recorded in their cash-basis accounting records for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010, and certain compliance requirements related to these transactions and balances. Management is responsible for recording transactions; and management and the Board are responsible for complying with the compliance requirements. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' attestation standards and applicable attestation engagement standards included in the Comptroller General of the United States' *Government Auditing Standards*. The sufficiency of the procedures is solely the responsibility of the parties specified in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose. The Library processes its financial transactions with the Auditor of State's Uniform Accounting Network (UAN). *Government Auditing Standards* considers this service to impair the independence of the Auditor of State to provide attest services to the Library because the Auditor of State designed, developed, implemented, and as requested, operates UAN. However, *Government Auditing Standards* permits the Auditor of State to perform this engagement, because Ohio Revised Code § 117.101 requires the Auditor of State to provide UAN services, and Ohio Revised Code § 117.11(A) mandates the Auditor of State to perform attest services for Ohio governments.

This report only describes exceptions exceeding \$10.

### Cash

1. We tested the mathematical accuracy of the December 31, 2011 and December 31, 2010 bank reconciliations. We found no exceptions.
2. We agreed the January 1, 2010 beginning fund balances recorded in the Fund Status Report to the December 31, 2009 balances in the documentation in the prior year Agreed-Upon Procedures working papers. We found no exceptions.
3. We agreed the totals per the bank reconciliations to the total of the December 31, 2011 and 2010 fund cash balances reported in the Fund Status Reports. The amounts agreed.
4. We confirmed the December 31, 2011 bank account balances with the Library's financial institutions. We found no exceptions. We also agreed the confirmed balances to the amounts appearing in the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation without exception.

### **Cash (Continued)**

5. We selected five reconciling debits (such as outstanding checks) haphazardly from the December 31, 2011 bank reconciliation:
  - a. We traced each debit to the subsequent January bank statement. We found no exceptions.
  - b. We traced the amounts and dates to the payment register, to determine the debits were dated prior to December 31. We noted no exceptions.

### **State Library and Local Government Support Receipts**

We selected two State Library and Local Government Support (LLGS) receipts from the County Vendor Audit Trail Report from 2011 and two from 2010.

- a. We compared the amount from the County Vendor Audit Trail Report to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
- b. We determined whether these receipts were posted to the General Fund. We found no exceptions.
- c. We determined whether the receipts were recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.
- d. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included one LLGS receipt per month for 2011 and 2010. We found no exceptions.

### **Property Taxes and Intergovernmental Cash Receipts**

1. We selected a property tax receipt from one *Statement of Semiannual Apportionment of Taxes* (the Statement) for 2011 (the Library's levy passed in 2010; therefore, collections were not remitted until 2011).
  - a. We traced the gross receipts from the *Statement* to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. The receipt was recorded in the proper year.
2. We scanned the Receipt Register Report to determine whether it included two real estate tax receipts for 2011. We noted the Receipt Register Report included the proper number of tax receipts for 2011.
3. We selected the only receipt from the State Distribution Transaction List (DTL) from 2011 (there was not a State Distribution Transaction List for 2010).
  - a. We compared the amount from the above report to the amount recorded in the Receipt Register Report. The amounts agreed.
  - b. We determined whether the receipt was allocated to the proper fund(s). We found no exceptions.
  - c. We determined whether the receipt was recorded in the proper year. We found no exceptions.

### **Debt**

1. The prior agreed-upon procedures disclosed no debt outstanding as of December 31, 2009.
2. We inquired of management, and scanned the Receipt Register Report and Payment Register Detail Report for evidence of debt issued during 2011 or 2010 or debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010. We noted no new debt issuances, nor any debt payment activity during 2011 or 2010.

**Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected one payroll check for five employees from 2011 and one payroll check for five employees from 2010 from the Employee Detail Adjustment Report and:
  - a. We compared the hours and pay rate, or salary recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report to supporting documentation (timecard, legislatively or statutorily-approved rate or salary). We found no exceptions.
  - b. We determined whether the fund and account code(s) to which the check was posted were reasonable based on the employees' duties as documented in the minute record. We also determined whether the payment was posted to the proper year. We found no exceptions.
  
2. For any new employees selected in step 1 we determined whether the following information in the employee's personnel file and minute record was consistent with the information used to compute gross and net pay related to this check:
  - a. Name.
  - b. Authorized salary or pay rate.
  - c. Department(s) and fund(s) to which the check should be charged.
  - d. Retirement system participation and payroll withholding.
  - e. Federal, State & Local income tax withholding authorization and withholding.
  - f. Any other deduction authorizations (deferred compensation, etc.).

We found no exceptions related to steps a. – f. above.

3. We scanned the last remittance of tax and retirement withholdings for the year ended December 31, 2011 to determine whether remittances were timely paid, and if the amounts paid agreed to the amounts withheld, plus the employer's share where applicable, during the final withholding period of 2011. We noted the following:

| <b>Withholding<br/>(plus employer share, where applicable)</b> | <b>Date<br/>Due</b> | <b>Date<br/>Paid</b> | <b>Amount<br/>Due</b> | <b>Amount<br/>Paid</b> |
|--|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Federal income taxes & Medicare                                | 1/31/12             | 12/31/11             | \$2,675.67            | \$2,675.67             |
| State income taxes   | 1/15/12             | 01/03/12             | \$433.35              | \$433.35               |
| Local income tax   | 1/31/12             | 01/26/12             | \$522.42              | \$522.42               |
| OPERS retirement   | 1/31/12             | 01/03/12             | \$4,869.76            | \$4,869.76             |

4. We haphazardly selected and recomputed one termination payment (unused vacation, etc.) using the following information, and agreed the computation to the amount paid as recorded in the Employee Detail Adjustment Report:
  - a. Accumulated leave records.
  - b. The employee's pay rate in effect as of the termination date.
  - c. The Library's payout policy.

The amount paid was consistent with the information recorded in a. through c. above.

### **Non-Payroll Cash Disbursements**

1. We haphazardly selected ten disbursements from the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and ten from the year ended 2010 and determined whether:
  - a. The disbursements were for a proper public purpose. We found no exceptions.
  - b. The check number, date, payee name and amount recorded on the returned, canceled check agreed to the check number, date, payee name and amount recorded in the Payment Register Detail Report and to the names and amounts on the supporting invoices. We found no exceptions.
  - c. The payment was posted to a fund consistent with the restricted purpose for which the fund's cash can be used. We found no exceptions.
2. We scanned the Payment Register Detail Report for the year ended December 31, 2011 and determined that the proceeds from the levy passed under Ohio Rev. Code Section 5705.23, were used for the purposes stated in the resolution.

### **Compliance – Budgetary**

1. We compared total appropriations required by Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-8-02, to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report for 2011 and 2010 for the General Fund and the Branch Library Fund. The amounts on the appropriation resolutions agreed to the amounts recorded in the Appropriation Status Report.
2. Ohio Admin. Code Section 117-8-02 prohibits spending in excess of budgeted amounts. We compared total expenditures to total appropriations for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for the General and Branch Library funds, as recorded in the Appropriation Status Report. We noted no funds for which expenditures exceeded appropriations.

### **Compliance – Contracts & Expenditures**

We inquired of management and scanned the Payment Register Detail report for the years ended December 31, 2011 and 2010 for procurements requiring competitive bidding to construct, demolish, alter, repair, or reconstruct a library or make any improvements or repairs, the cost of which exceeded \$25,000, except in cases of urgent necessity or for the security and protection of library property (Ohio Rev. Code Section 3375.41).

We identified no purchases subject to the aforementioned bidding requirements.

We were not engaged to, and did not conduct an examination, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the Library's receipts, disbursements, balances and compliance with certain laws and regulations. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.



This report is intended solely for the information and use of management, those charged with governance, and others within the Library, and is not intended to be, and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dave Yost". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "D".

**Dave Yost**  
Auditor of State

March 20, 2012

**This page intentionally left blank.**



# Dave Yost • Auditor of State

**KATE LOVE SIMPSON LIBRARY**

**MORGAN COUNTY**

**CLERK'S CERTIFICATION**

**This is a true and correct copy of the report which is required to be filed in the Office of the Auditor of State pursuant to Section 117.26, Revised Code, and which is filed in Columbus, Ohio.**

*Susan Babbitt*

**CLERK OF THE BUREAU**

**CERTIFIED  
APRIL 17, 2012**